



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/635,624

08/10/2000

Paul A. Firestone

5848

20311

7590

06/16/2004

MUSERLIAN AND LUCAS AND MERCANTI, LLP  
475 PARK AVENUE SOUTH  
NEW YORK, NY 10016

EXAMINER

FRANKLIN, JAMARA ALZAIDA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2876

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Applicati n N .

09/635,624

Applicant(s)

FIRESTONE, PAUL A.

Examiner

Jamara A. Franklin

Art Unit

2876

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears n the cover sheet with the c rrespondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM  
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 May 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11,13,15,16,18,20,22,23,25 and 26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11,13,15,16,18,20,22,23,25 and 26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission received on 5/25/04 has been entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 11, 13, 15, 16, 18, 20, 22, 23, 25, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Urbish et al. (US 5,734,343) (hereinafter referred to as 'Urbish') in view of Slavin et al. (US 5,819,234) (hereinafter referred to as 'Slavin') and Leitner et al. (US 5,587,575) (hereinafter referred to as 'Leitner').

Urbish teaches a way to eliminate the tollbooth by eliminating the need for vehicles to slow or stop and deposit toll payments at the toll booth (col. 4, lines 46-58). A plurality of labels 15 are affixed in a variety of different locations on a vehicle 10 (col. 2, lines 45-51). The label contains information of a fixed nature, for example, the vehicle identification number, in a

Art Unit: 2876

coded form. Bar codes have been found to be the label which is most machine readable, however, icons and alphanumeric text are also quite readable and may be used effectively.

These various types may be used singly or in combination in the identification label (col. 3, lines 39-51). A detector 25 is used to pick up information (including identification number) about the vehicle 10 that is read from the label 15 as the vehicle and label pass under a light source 20.

The identification number is then used to assess tolls on the vehicle as it passes a certain location (col. 4, lines 10-29).

Urbish lacks the specific teaching of establishing an account with the identification code at a central agency and transferring data containing the identification code from the reader to the central agency.

Slavin teaches an account corresponding to a transponder 30 and unique tag number for charging toll. The account is established at a Customer Service Center 72 (col. 5, lines 53-60).

One of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized that establishing an account to be charged against would have been beneficial to the invention of Urbish since an account could have served as a established source for recording the charges made against the vehicle to which the account is associated. Therefore, it would have been obvious, at the time the invention was made, to modify the teachings of Urbish with the aforementioned teachings of Slavin to help maintain a history of tolls collected.

Urbish/Slavin lack the teaching of moving readers.

Leitner teaches portable readers for use by police or traffic officials to scan a code that has been attached to a vehicle (col. 3, lines 18-20 and lines 60-62).

One of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized that moving the reader in conjunction to the code would have been beneficial to the invention of Urbish/Slavin for allowing the code to be read in a variety of conditions and situations including a case where the vehicle to which the code is affixed is located in an area not equipped for a fixed reader. Therefore, it would have been obvious, at the time the invention was made, to modify the teachings of Urbish/Slavin with the moving reader as taught by Leitner. Furthermore, the notion that a device can be made movable or portable is an obvious improvement upon the device unless there are new and unexpected results.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments entered 5/25/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The examiner maintains the rejection.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, one would have been motivated using knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the mobile scanner with the invention of Urbish.

Again, in response to applicant's arguments against the Leitner reference individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are

Art Unit: 2876

based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). In this particular instance, the Leitner reference is relied upon *only* to support a teaching of a mobile reader which reads a vehicle identifier when a vehicle is stationary.

### ***Conclusion***

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.


Bantli et al. (US 5,608,391) teach an electronic license plate architecture.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jamara A. Franklin whose telephone number is (571) 272-2389. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:00am to 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee can be reached on (571) 272-2398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.


Art Unit: 2876

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Jamara A. Franklin  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2876

JAF  
June 10, 2004



MICHAEL G. LEE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800